

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-29 are rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Claims based on the arguments presented below.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. in view of Prehn. The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention that are set forth in Claims 1-29 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Thomas et al. in view of Prehn.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which is drawn to a method for interfacing with a home automation system using a router. Claim 1 is reproduced below in its entirety for the convenience of the Examiner.

1. A method for interfacing with a home automation system using a router comprising:
 - receiving a control signal from an instant messenger application, the control signal received by the router via a communications network, wherein the transmission of the control signal is initiated by the instant messenger application;
 - transmitting the control signal to at least one appliance to control the appliance in accordance with the control signal; and
 - transmitting a reply to the instant messenger application regarding a status of the appliance.

Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain limitations similar to those contained in Claim 1. Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1 and recite further limitations of the present invention. Claims 9-14 depend from Claim 8 and recite further limitations of the present invention. Claims 16-22 depend from Claim 15 and recite further limitations of the present invention. Claims 24-29 depend from Claim 23 and recite further limitations of the present invention.

As mentioned above, Thomas et al. in view of Prehn does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of Applicant's invention as are set forth in the Claims. A deficiency of this combination is that the primary reference Thomas et al. does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of the Claims and the secondary reference Prehn fails to teach or suggest the limitations not taught or suggested by Thomas et al. In particular, Thomas et al. does not teach or suggest a method for interfacing with a home automation system using a router that includes "receiving a control signal from an instant messenger application, wherein the control signal is received by the router via a communications network, and wherein the transmission of the control signal is initiated by the instant messenger application" as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations). And, Prehn does not teach these limitations to remedy the deficiencies of Thomas et al.

Thomas et al. shows a dissimilar system for remote monitoring and control of appliances over a computer network. Thomas et al. discloses that home appliances can be monitored by a user who can initiate a process for control of an appliance after the completion of a process for checking its status. Importantly, the focus of Thomas et al. is remote but manual user monitoring and control of appliances. This is clearly distinct from the invention set forth in Applicant's claims which is related to the automated control of a home appliance via a router by an instant messaging application (as opposed to manual control by a user).

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23 now expressly indicate that the transmission of a signal that controls the aforementioned appliances are initiated by an instant messaging application. This stands in stark contrast to subject matter disclosed in Thomas that indicates that the appliances are controlled by a remote user.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Thomas et al. reference is a method that uses a router that receives a control signal from an instant messaging application and transmits the control signal to a home appliance, wherein the transmission of the control signal is initiated by the instant messenger application taught or suggested as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations).

Prehn does not teach or suggest a modification of Thomas et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of Thomas et al. outlined above. More specifically, Prehn does not teach or suggest a method for interfacing with a home automation system using a router that includes “receiving a control signal from an instant messenger application, the control signal received by the router via a communications network, wherein the transmission of the control signal is initiated by the instant messenger application” as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations).

Prehn discloses a security communication and remote property monitoring/response system. Prehn discloses that an instant messaging system can be used to notify individuals on a contact list if an intruder to a monitored property is detected. This use of instant messaging as a notification mechanism is clearly distinct from use of instant messaging delimited by Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations) which focuses on the use of instant messaging to control home appliances. As such, the use of the instant messaging system disclosed by Prehn cannot be equated with the use of the instant messaging as set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations).

Accordingly, the disclosure of the instant messaging application by Prehn does not teach or suggest a use of instant messaging that would remedy the deficiencies of

Thomas et al. Therefore, the combination of Thomas et al. and Prehn does not teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations) as is required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. As such, the basis for the prima facie case made by the examiner is inadequate thus rendering the aforementioned rejection of the Claims based on Thomas et al. and Prehn improper.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Prehn reference is a method that employs the use of a router to receive a control signal from an instant messaging application wherein the transmission of the control signal is initiated by the instant messenger application taught or suggested as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 8, 15 and 23 contain similar limitations). Consequently, as the Prehn reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Thomas et al., the embodiments of the claimed invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Thomas et al. in view of Prehn.

As Thomas et al. in view of Prehn possesses the deficiencies that are outlined above, Applicant respectfully submits that Thomas et al. in view of Prehn does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as set forth in Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23, and as such, Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Thomas et al. in view of Prehn does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as set forth in Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24-29 dependent on Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23, and that Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-22 and 16-24 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 12/12, 2006


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060